REMARKS

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-11 are pending, claims 1, 7 and 9 being independent.

There are no formal matters outstanding.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected as obvious over applicant's disclosed prior art in view of PASTERNAK et al. 5,648,969.

Applicant's disclosed prior art (Figure 1) is offered as disclosing the recited invention of claim 1, 7 and 9 less the recitation of "**second means for making said first means become a reset state when said first means continues to abandon said transmission message signal after a predetermined time duration** (claim 1)" or "**after the error state continues for a predetermined time duration, the central processing unit resets the ATM data reception section to place the individual VPI/VCI value to a no-set condition** (claim 7)" or "**the selected base station further comprising means for resetting the individual VPI/VCI value at the selected radio base station to a no-set condition, upon the error state continuing past a predetermined time duration** (claim 9)".

PASTERNAK et al. column 6, lines 35-54 is used by the Official Action as the basis for concluding that the original claims were obvious (see Figure 10).

The Official Action indicates that this passage teaches having a VCI/VPI table capable of automatic updating, that table including a predetermined time duration (time stamp) to time-out connections when traffic is not received.

The Official Action would modify the manual reset of applicant's prior art device with an automatic reset based on a "no traffic time-out."

First, applicant does not believe that such a modification would be obvious. Second, even if the modification were made, the resulting structure would not meet the recitations.

The teaching of PASTERNAK et al. would be directed to the base station control apparatus which would maintain a table such as disclosed by PASTERNAK et al. Figure 10. The claims' recitations being considered are directed to the individual base stations themselves, not to the base station control apparatus.

PASTERNAK et al. does not teach using the time-out to reset an individual base station, and further does not place the base station in a "no-set condition". PASTERNAK et al. only teaches to have the base station control apparatus to stop monitoring the inactive VCI/VPI value. However, this is not what is recited.

Further, even if the "time-out" were applied to the base stations, the recitations include the requirement of both an

error condition and an elapsed time period. The PASTERNAK et al. time-out time period is not conditioned on the beginning of an error state.

Still further, in the error condition being addressed by the present invention, a message correctly sent to the base station, but not accepted due to error, is resent. See the application drawing figures. The message being repeatedly resent without acceptance is what necessitates the manual reset of the base station in the prior art of applicant's Figure 1.

In the PASTERNAK et al. system, the resending of the message would keep the connection from being reset.

Part of the confusion here appears to be the Official Action stating "… when traffic is not received." Applicant believes that a proper understanding of PASTERNAK et al. would be to say there is a time-out when traffic is **not being sent.**

The PASTERNAK et al. central table for all VPI/VCI is used to track activity on each individual VPI/VCI, i.e., *activity by base station control apparatus to plural base stations.* This is a function of the base station control apparatus and reflects traffic being sent.

Thus, the reference teaches updating a VPI/VCI table to reflect activity on the **transmission side** so as to allocate service for cell transmission only on pathways that have transmission demand.

When disclosing the strategy to erase expired connections (connections in which to tracking is being sent), the teaching is stop tracking inactive connections (no traffic being sent) in order to track the active connections and allocate connections to pathways having traffic. When traffic on any connection resumes, tracking/allocation would resume and a new VPI/VCI would be assigned. Again, however, note there is no teaching of placing the base station in a no-set condition.

There is no suggestion as to monitoring elapsed time between incoming messages, and certainly no teaching as to measuring elapsed time subsequent to an error condition being set.

In view of all of the above, the obviousness rejection is not believed to be viable. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is respectfully requested.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional

fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Reg. No. 35,041 for

Roland E. Long, Jr., Reg. No. 41,949
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
        (703) 979-4709

REL/lk